



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,882	12/13/2000	Amit J. Patel	0026-0010	5682

26615 7590 10/10/2002

HARRITY & SNYDER, LLP
11240 WAPLES MILL ROAD
SUITE 300
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

SOLAIMAN, SHIREEN I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/734,882

Applicant(s)

PATEL ET AL.

Examiner

Shireen I Solaiman

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears on the cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/13/00.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Aalbersberg (U.S. Patent # 5,946,678).

As to claims 1 and 7, Aalbersberg discloses a method and a system to be performed by a client device for highlighting search terms in documents distributed over a network (see fig. 6, External Document base and see column 6 lines 48-55), comprising: generating a search query including a search term (see column 7, lines 17-58); receiving a list of one or more references to documents in the network in response to the search query (see column 7, lines 61-67 and see Fig. 4, search window); receiving selection of one of the references (see column 8, lines 17-20) retrieving a document corresponding to the selected reference (see column 8, lines 17-20, the

Art Unit: 2175

selected document is displayed in the viewer window 62); and highlighting the search term in the retrieved document (see column 8 lines 21-25).

As to claim 2, Aalbersberg discloses wherein the highlighting includes: automatically searching the retrieved document to locate each occurrence of the search term (see fig. 5, highlighting of each occurrence of the word implies automatic iterative search), and for each occurrence of the search term, changing a characteristic of the search term in the retrieved document (see column 6 lines 11-13).

As to claim 3, Aalbersberg discloses wherein the changing includes: changing at least one of a color, font, style, effect, and size of the search term in the retrieved document (see column 6 lines 11-13, effect reads on lightly shaded background, see fig. 5).

As to claim 4, Aalbersberg discloses providing the retrieved document with the highlighted search term to a user (see column 8 lines 21-25, see fig. 5 the viewer window 52).

As to claim 8, Aalbersberg discloses a client device that highlights search terms in documents remotely distributed over a network (see column 6 lines 48-55) to aid in the determination of relevance of the documents (see abstract, lines 11-17), comprising: a memory configured to store instructions (see Fig 1, Memory 13); and a processor configured to execute the instructions in the memory to generate a search query that includes a search term (see Fig 1, CPU 12 and Fig. 6, FTR Engine 60), obtain a list of one or more references to documents

Art Unit: 2175

in the network (see column 7, lines 61-67 and Fig. 6 External Document base 61) using the search query, obtain selection of one of the references, retrieve a document corresponding to the selected reference (see fig. 5, viewer window 52), and highlight the search term in the retrieved document (see column 8 lines 21-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 6 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aalbersberg (U.S. Patent # 5,946,678 in view of Stern et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,397,218).

As to claim 5, Aalbersberg does not teach wherein the references include links to documents in the network.

Stern et al. teaches wherein the references include links to documents in the network (see column 2 lines 42-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg wherein the references include links to documents in the network.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg by the teachings of Stern et al. wherein the references include links to documents in the network because many Web domains have other links buried within their pages, and restricting a search to a specific Web domain results in ignoring information contained in these links.

As to claim 6, Aalbersberg discloses wherein the generating includes: sending the search query to one of a search engine (see column 6 lines 48-55 and fig. 6, FTR).

Aalbersberg does not teach a web directory to obtain the list of one or more references.

Stern et al. teaches a web directory to obtain the list of one or more references (see column 1 lines 57-67 and see column 2 lines 42-46, all pages meeting criteria are returned as successful objects of the search).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg to include a web directory to obtain the list of one or more references.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg by the teachings of Stern et al. to include a web directory to obtain the list of one or more references because these sites provide various indexes to other sites.

As to claim 9, Aalbersberg discloses a browser assistant that interacts with a browser on a client device (see Fig. 6, FTR Engine 60 and Fig. 7), comprising: instructions for generating a

Art Unit: 2175

search query including a search term (see column 7, lines 17-58); instructions for obtaining a list of one or more links to documents distributed over a network using the search query (see Fig. 6, FTR Engine 60 and Fig. 7, Document Base is external implies over a network); and instructions for highlighting the search term in the retrieved document(see column 8 lines 21-25).

Aalbersberg does not teach instructions for obtaining selection of one of the links; instructions for retrieving a document corresponding to the selected link.

Stern et al. teaches instructions for obtaining selection of one of the links (see column 4 lines 27-63); instructions for retrieving a document corresponding to the selected link (see column 5 lines 14-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg to include instructions for obtaining selection of one of the links; instructions for retrieving a document corresponding to the selected link.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg by the teachings of Stern et al. to include instructions for obtaining selection of one of the link and instructions for retrieving a document corresponding to the selected link because many Web domains have other links buried within their pages, and restricting a search to a specific Web domain results in ignoring information contained in these links.

As to claim 10, Aalbersberg discloses computer-readable medium that stores instructions executable by at least one processor (see Fig 1, CPU 12), comprising: receive a list of one or

Art Unit: 2175

more references to documents distributed over a network in response to the search query (see Fig. 6, FTR Engine 60 and Fig. 7, Document Base is external implies over a network), receive selection of one or more of the references (see column 7, lines 61-67), and retrieve one or more documents corresponding to the selected one or more references (see column 8 lines 17-20); and a browser assistant (see Fig. 6, FTR Process 3 and Fig. 7) configured to intercept the one or more documents, highlight the search term in the one or more documents, and present the one or more documents, with the highlighted search term, to a user (see column 8 lines 21-25).

Aalbersberg does not teach a browser configured to generate a search query that includes a search term.

Stern et al. teaches a browser configured to generate a search query that includes a search term (see abstract, lines 12-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg to include a browser configured to generate a search query that includes a search term.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg by the teachings of Stern et al. to include a browser configured to generate a search query that includes a search term because the browser establishes hypertext links to the subject server, enabling the user to view graphical and textual representations of information provided by the server.

As to claim 11, Aalbersberg as modified discloses wherein when highlighting, the browser assistant (see Fig. 6, FTR Process 3 and Fig. 7) is configured to identify the search term

Art Unit: 2175

in the one or more documents and, for each occurrence of the search term in the one or more documents, change a characteristic of the search term (see Fig 5, viewer window 52, and see column 6 lines 11-30).

As to claim 12, Aalbersberg discloses, comprising: instructions for obtaining a search term (see column 7, lines 17-19); instructions for generating a search query from the search term (see column 7, lines 33-58); instructions for obtaining a list of one or more references to documents distributed over a network using the search query (see column 7, lines 61-67); instructions for retrieving a document corresponding to one of the one or more references (see column 8 lines 17-20); instructions for highlighting each occurrence of the search term in the retrieved document (see Fig. 5, each occurrence is highlighted implies instruction to highlight); and instructions for displaying the highlighted document to a user (see column 8 lines 21-25).

Aalbersberg does not teach a web browser.

Stern et al. teaches a web browser.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg to include a web browser.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg by the teachings of Stern et al. to include a web browser because the browser establishes hypertext links to the subject server, enabling the user to view graphical and textual representations of information provided by the server.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kleinberg (U.S. Patent # 6,112,202) searching for desired items from a network of information resources. In particular, the system and method have advantageous applicability to searching for World Wide Web pages having desired content. An initial set of pages are selected, preferably by running a conventional keyword-based query, and then further selecting pages pointing to, or pointed to from, the pages found by the keyword-based query. Then, iteratively, authoritativeness values are computed for the pages of the initial set, based on the number of links to and from the pages. One or more communities of pages are likely to be of particular interest and value to the user who is interested in the keyword-based query or the single page.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shireen I Solaiman whose telephone number is 703-305-5893. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-6:30 M-Thur.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2175

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

SIS
October 8, 2002

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Charles Rones".

CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER